DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 574 HE 033 414

AUTHOR	Kang, Bai; Miller, Michael T.
TITLE	Faculty Development: Research Findings, the Literature Base, and Directions for Future Scholarship.
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	18p.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Job Satisfaction; Productivity; Sabbatical Leaves; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Improvement; Teacher Morale; Teacher Motivation; *Teaching Conditions
IDENTIFIERS	Career Stages; Teacher Commitment

ABSTRACT

This literature review assesses where higher education is in relation to faculty development and where faculty development efforts need to go. Literature on faculty development has addressed the nature of faculty development in light of faculty needs at various stages of their professional careers. Results suggest that career stage affects teachers' attitudes and job behaviors. The literature also indicates that faculty development is closely related to strengthened faculty morale and vitality, improved teaching performance, enhanced research motivation and productivity, and increased job satisfaction and work commitment. Some research shows that teaching conditions and quality of life affect faculty morale. In order to foster faculty development and enhance faculty improvement programs, specific methods have been suggested and practiced, including: treating faculty with respect, valuing faculty as professionals, allowing faculty governance, and offering rewards. Some paid leave programs, including sabbaticals, have been appreciated by teachers because they provide sufficient time to carry out research projects or engage in instructional development education. Faculty commitment is a key element in effective faculty development. Results justify the necessity for faculty development as a means of improving higher education institutions as a whole. (Contains 11 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 446 574

Faculty Development:

Research Findings, the Literature Base, and Directions for Future Scholarship

Bai Kang, Ed.D.
Coordinator of Institutional Research and Effectiveness
Troy State University Dothan
Dothan, AL 36304-0368
(334) 932-6556 extension 245
bkang@tsud.edu

Michael T. Miller, Ed.D.
Associate Dean
College of Education
San Jose State University
One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192-0071
(408) 924-3600
mmiller5@email.sjsu.edu

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Miller
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE033414

Abstract

Literature related to faculty development has addressed the nature of faculty development in light of the faculty needs at various stages of their professional careers. As indicated in the relevant literature, faculty development is closely related to strengthened faculty morale and vitality, improved teaching performance, enhanced research motivation and productivity, and increased job satisfaction and work commitment. In order to foster faculty development and improve faculty improvement programs, specific methods have been suggested and practiced, including the sabbatical leave. Faculty working conditions and environments were also analyzed in this section, which further justified the necessity of faculty development as a means to improve higher education institutions as a whole.

A college or university's faculty is often a common criterion for determining institutional prestige and quality. Although many other factors can be built into an institution's claim for quality, faculty are the most prominent feature in determining the quality level of instruction. A logical investment, then, is in the tools that enable faculty to perform their jobs better. With a potentially stronger and more capable faculty, the argument subsequently can hold that students learn more and perform better.

But how do faculty, as teachers, as adult learners, as scholars, learn? How do they assemble experiences, knowledge, and personal reflections among other variables to impact their performance and do a better job of offering instruction to individuals who voluntarily choose to arrive on campus to learn? The notion of faculty development is generally based on a faculty member's voluntarily effort for self-improvement, and humanistically, accepts the notion that faculty are life-long learners and are capable, even anxious, to improve their content knowledge and performance abilities. Numerous writings attempt to address some of these issues, even involving the topic of non-voluntarily faculty development and how faculty who perceive the topic with some degree of hostility or resistance can take something meaningful from an experience, reading, workshop, etc.

In the review and examination of the literature base, much can be addressed, and other than some topical or chronological explorations of literature, the task of sorting this body of work can be daunting. In an effort to synthesize some of the literature, and to offer possibly some meaningful commentary on what to undertake next, this literature

exploration is offered as a preliminary step in assessing where higher education is with faculty development, and more importantly, where these efforts need to go.

Literature Sampling

The literature base of faculty development is massive, often including personal narratives, case study reports, national and even international studies, and pontifical statements of what could or should be done to improve faculty performance. This discussion makes no attempt to cover the entire gamut of faculty development literature, but rather, provides a highlight of some of the references that are particularly valuable to the student of higher education, the faculty development professional, and the administrator with cause to be concerned about faculty performance.

Tien and Blackurn (1996) studied the system of faculty ranks as related to research motivation and productivity, in which they investigated and explored the questions of how academic promotion motivated research behavior. The findings of the study indicated that the assistant professors did not publish less than the associate professors, the associate professors showed the least variation in productivity, and full professors, though not all, were the most productive faculty. The reason for this, they claimed, was that assistant and associate professors who stayed in the rank longer than an average of six years were less productive than other colleagues in the same ranks, and that the longer a faculty member stayed in a rank, the less likely they were to be promoted. However, things were different for full professors. For full professors, salary increases and peer recognition, pure enjoyment, continuing dedication to search for truths and to share them via the accepted outlet of journals, continued to operate during the full professorship for

them. Tein and Blackburn concluded that rewards such as promotion may have different meanings and motivational effects on faculty members, and such an inquiry would more fully explain faculty attitudes and behaviors in relation to their research productivity.

Halford (1994) studied faculty morale and attached great importance to the enhancement of faculty morale even in times of diminishing resources and challenges. One of the causes that led to low faculty morale, as found in Paducah (Kentucky) Community College, was low self-esteem. Halford found that teachers who believed that they were treated with respect and valued as professionals were more effective than those who did not believe so. Halford suggested that in times of limited resources, enhanced self-esteem and shared governance would provide the tools to reshape existing resources for a more effective learning environment.

Relying on faculty development programs to be a form of "retraining" and placing emphasis on additional workplace training, faculty members need to become aware of their needs and skills. Dayhaw-Barker (19) particularly noted that labor-preparation mechanisms (e.g. graduate preparation programs) need to promote concepts of life-long learning, but that the more immediate need lies in the ability of an institution to offer effective and meaningful faculty development programs, noting the sabbatical as one such mechanism to jump start a revitalization effort. Other types of programs identified were institutional sharing of faculty, summer workshops, fellowships, residencies, and other clinical experiences where faculty could build ownership in their own developmental activities.

Kalivoda, Sorrell, and Simpson (1994) addressed the significance of faculty vitality as a critical ingredient in sustaining the vitality of higher education institutions. Their study was intended to identify the common attitudes, beliefs, and values of faculty members at a research university and to determine how these factors fluctuated over the course of the faculty member's career, so that faculty development efforts might be better tailored to meet the distinctive career-stage needs of the professorate. Through their study, they found that research-university faculty at the assistant, associate, and full professor levels shared many common attitudes, beliefs, and values about the academic career. At the same time, differences were revealed across the three career stages.

New and junior faculty placed a different emphasis on academic career goals and experienced more acute levels of stress and frustration than did mid- and senior-career faulty members. Three areas were outlined in the Kalivoda, Sorrell, and Simpson study where new and junior faculty could have benefited from faculty development. They included activities designed to enhance teaching skills and teaching styles; mentoring relationships with senior faculty which can facilitate the building of collegiality; and activities to promote scholarly productivity and to develop writing skills.

For mid-career faculty, activities aimed at preventing becoming professionally stuck and programs to sustain vitality were suggested, which included career development workshops, instructional grants programs, and sabbaticals, as mid-career faculty, they found, perceived themselves to be at the peak of concern about reputation and recognition, which could lead to professional burnout and dissatisfaction. For senior faculty, the study reported that they needed to rejuvenate their sense of professional

vitality by engaging in opportunities to sharpen research and scholarship skills in their discipline or related fields.

Kalivoda, Sorrell, and Simpson concluded that faculty can sustain and enhance their professional vitality by engaging in various faculty development activities targeted to their career stages, and can benefit from those activities which bring them together to discuss issues of teaching and scholarship in a collegial and intellectually challenging environment.

Also in 1994, D'Cruz-Endeley studied the faculty development needs of faculty at Rima College in Malaysia. Using the Hunter-Beyen faculty development needs assessment survey, and as revised by D'Cruz-Endeley, she achieved a 95% response rate (n=62), and found that faculty most desired training on productivity, credibility in serving as a lecturer, and teaching expertise. Administrators at the college believed their faculty to need training on instructional performance, classroom management, and course and teaching evaluations. Although faculty were found to prefer workshops, seminars, and getting materials from their library, professional associations were cited as a potential major contributing factor in faculty development delivery, and incentives for development identified as desirable were merit pay, release time, and sabbaticals.

Neumann and Finaly-Neumann (1990) studied faculty members' commitment to their employing university, based on career stage and level of productivity, and, additionally, they assessed the relative powers of rewards and support variables, using a stratified random sample of 40 research university departments. The findings suggested that the reward-support framework played a meaningful role in determining faculty

commitment to their employing universities and that support indicators were more important in predicting faculty commitment. They also indicated that career stage and research productivity had little or no direct effect on faculty commitment.

Morrow and McElroy (1987) studied three career stage categories, including age, organizational tenure, and positional tenure. Using Department of Transportation employees as study subjects, 4,000 employees were surveyed about work commitment and job satisfaction. With 2,200 responses, little impact was found from career stage operationalization and work commitment and job satisfaction. Chronological age was determined to account for the majority of the variance among work measures (job involvement, organizational commitment, work ethic endorsement, and intention to stay at the current employment) and job satisfaction factors (using the job descriptive index developed by Smith in the 1960s). These findings have an applicability to other occupations and careers where age and the length of time in employment can be related to job performance and satisfaction (i.e., college faculty).

Slocum and Cron (1985) conducted a study that was designed to investigate the relationship between Super's three career stages - trial, stablization, and maintenance, and work attitudes and behaviors. The results of their study suggested that career stages affect attitudes and job behaviors. People in the trial stage of their career tended to shift jobs more frequently and had a greater propensity to relocate and leave their present employers to find the right job if it meant a promotion. In the stabilization stage, people stopped exploring different occupational choices but had typically moved between

company and jobs to advance in their chosen occupation. The third stage, the maintenance career stage, was a time for leveling off in terms of career aspirations and advancement.

Based on 532 interviews with "rank-and-file" faculty members and administrators, Schuster and Brown (1985) studied of the faculty's condition. In their study, they traced recent changes in the quality of faculty life and assessed the consequences of these changes for the future of higher education and sought to describe shifts in the faculty's demographic characteristics, compensation, work environment, status, and morale, and in the quality of newly recruited faculty. The findings of their study revealed that between 1970 and 1983, the faculty experienced a sharp decline in salary and at the same time noted a deterioration of quality in the faculty work environment. In addition, as a result of inflation, the academic labor market had been severely affected, with relatively few job openings in most academic fields. As a result of these unfavorable situations, they found there was a weakening of faculty morale on almost all campuses, where the performance of a dispirited faculty, stressed and anxious about the future, had led to the loss of faculty vitality. They suggested that because of the declining faculty vitality, students showed less interest in pursuing academic careers, the proportion of the students selecting academic career had fallen off steeply, and preference for academic careers has dropped sharply. Furthermore, higher education institutions had difficulty hiring outstanding new faculty members to meet the needs of higher education advancement.

Discussion and Research Directions

Faculty development has been a crucial mechanism that helps maintain and improve the quality of higher education. In many institutions, faculty development has become such an important part of the daily schedule on the desk of administrators that a faculty development component has been included within their institutional effectiveness efforts. These development programs allow faculty to improve instructional materials, keep abreast of new technology and methods that can be used in the delivery of instruction, and network with professional colleagues. Regardless of topics, all faculty development programs center on building effective faculty, and possible questions for research related to faculty development are then drawn from both the literature base and the concepts presented in the literature. Questions might include:

- What works for faculty development, and why does it work?
- What are the cognitive patterns of faculty participating in developmental programs, and what the tendencies for outcomes based on these patterns?
- What are the institutional cultural or environmental factors that influence or impact voluntarily decisions to participate, and what factors have bearing on different levels of outcome and long-term performance changes?
- How can or should faculty development be measured? Does the over-riding concept of renewal imply that "newness" has something to do with performance, and if so, what are the criteria for faculty performance that have relationship with the concept of renewal?

Based on the literature reviewed, effective faculty development aims enhanced faculty morale, strengthened faculty vitality, and highlighted faculty commitment, all three of which contribute tremendously to an institution that accomplishes its goals and mission effectively and efficiently. Faculty morale plays a critical role in building a successful faculty career path. With enhanced morale, faculty members can always develop positive attitudes towards and beliefs in their career growth and will devote themselves wholeheartedly to meeting the distinctive career-needs of the professorate. As a result, they take an active part in the three basic collegiate functions of teaching, research, and service, and concentrate their efforts on both searching for truth themselves and nurturing personnel as needed for society as a whole. In turn, in an institution where faculty morale is high, faculty performance in teaching and research can always motivate students in their academic pursuits, stimulating them to work hard, involving them actively in various academic and social activities, and provoking them intellectually to challenge the nature in which truths are yet to be discovered, since, as is expected by all, the impact of the faculty, both intellectually and ideologically, on students is obvious and tremendous. Along with that, quality teaching and learning excellence are the intended result.

However, as identified by Halford (1994), the enhancement of faculty morale has proven not to be easy, especially in times of diminishing resources and for those with low self-esteem, both identified as major causes for low faculty morale. Although many programs have been developed to help enhance faculty morale, higher education administrators and educational researchers have noticed the importance of treating faculty

with respect and valuing them as professionals so as to enhance their self-esteem. Additionally, in light of the notion of playing an important role in campus decision making and policy formation, faculty governance has also proved to be an effective tool to reshape existing resources so that faculty roles become visible in institutional advancement. Finally, a reward system, as recommended by Tien and Blackurn, should and will never be the last thing to consider, as rewards such as a promotion or even a public compliment in words or on a postal board will be a best explanation of the faculty's attitudes and behaviors as related to their teaching performance, research productivity, and community or social services.

Dynamically related to faculty morale as another critical element that jointly builds up effective faculty development; faculty vitality exerts a considerable influence on the quality of an institution and is fundamental to the achievement of the institutional goals for excellence. According to Clark and Corcoran (1998), faculty vitality is affected by professional socialization, organizational structure, and organizational conditions, which, in turn, are improved and enhanced by faculty vitality. Though faculty vitality is significant to the vitality and quality of a higher education institution, research, however, has shown that after teaching continuously for several years, if not renewing knowledge and skills in a timely manner, faculty demonstrate lower levels of satisfaction and increased feelings of burnout (Dayhaw-Baker, 1994), with which faculty vitality would decline. Considering the fact that the quality of faculty is the most crucial ingredient in the excellence of higher education and faculty renewal has been and continues to be the primary emphasis of colleges and universities, this has intensified the need for constantly

maintaining the vitality of faculty who are the building blocks of an institution in order to maintain the vitality and quality of the institution. To achieve that purpose, faculty development programs that enhance faculty professional skills and academic growth in either specific disciplines or relevant fields need to be advanced and provided for faculty knowledge and skill renewal in different stages of career development. While such programs as seminars, workshops, library resources, professional associations provide good opportunities to share expertise and exchange experiences and engage faculty in activities like discussions that help sustain and enhance faculty professional vitality, most institutions use guest speakers, informal "brown bag" gatherings, on-campus faculty development centers, or retreats to provide faculty development (Gullatt & Weaver, 1997). Some paid leave programs, such as sabbaticals, have been cherished by faculty because they provide sufficient time to carry out research projects or engage in instructional development education and free them from their routine duties and responsibilities so that they can concentrate their efforts on the projects they have long planned to accomplish.

Though not directly related or much affected by career stage and research productivity, as revealed in the literature review, faculty commitment is a key element effective faculty development needs to address and a faculty development program should improve. A faculty member may have high morale and a knowledge base and skills can be very good, but if the individual did not possess a strong commitment to an institution, lack of good work ethic could result. Evidence of lack of faculty commitment is faculty frequently deserting an institution and seeking employment somewhere else. In

order to highlight faculty commitment, programs are needed to educate faculty, especially new faculty, and help them develop their faith and loyalty to their institutions. In addition, a special faculty development framework or indicator, such as reward-support framework suggested by Neumann and Finally-Neumann, also needs to be developed to determine and predict faculty commitment to their employing institutions so that faculty can contribute their best to helping ensure the effectiveness of their employing institutions.

Another dimension to all of the debate about criteria and methods of developmental program assessment is the notion of planning and pre-established criteria for faculty development programs. Bai, Miller, and Newman (2000) noted the following criteria to consider with faculty development program assessment:

- The extent to which the faculty development plan is implemented;
- How much the institution benefits from the faculty development program;
- Improved teaching performance;
- Application of new knowledge, skills, or technology in instruction;
- Increased research productivity or scholarly output;
- Value or quality of scholarly output.

They also recommended that follow-ups be conducted of the faculty who have been through certain faculty development programs to track the performance of teaching, research, and service so that the effectiveness of the faculty development program can be best defined and determined.

Both generally and specifically, faculty development is a pressing need for higher education, and college administrators must make special note of how these programs work and what they can do. Together with institutional research personnel and instructional colleagues, programs that work can be fashioned around principles of effectiveness and student learning. And as public accountability measures become increasingly commonplace in the higher education industry, administrators and leaders must recognize the value of enhancing their human capital.

References

Bai, K., Miller, M. T., & Newman, R. E. (2000). Sabbatical assessment measures: evaluating faculty leave programs. Journal of Staff, Program, & Organization Development, 17(1), 31-38.

Dayhaw-Barker, P. (1994). Are qualified faculty an endangered or an evolving species? Optometric Education, 20(1), 23-24.

D'Cruz-Endeley, C. C. (1994). Faculty development needs as perceived by the faculty and administrators at RIMA College, Malaysia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

Gullatt, D. E., & Weaver, S. W. (1997). Use of faculty development activities to improve the effectiveness of U.S. institutions of higher education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education, Hines City, FL. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 414 796.

Halford, A. (1994). Faculty morale—enhancing it in spite of diminishing resources and challenges. Paper presented at the International Conference for Community College Chairs, Deans, and Other Instructional Leaders, Phoenix, AZ. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 368 422.

Kalivoda, P., Sorrell, G. R., & Simpson, R. D. (1994). Nurturing faculty vitality by matching institutional interventions with career needs. Innovative Higher Education, 18(4), 255-272.

Morrow, P. C., & McElroy, J. C. (1987). Work commitment and job satisfaction over three career stages. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 30, 330-46.

Neumann, Y., & Finaly-Neumann, E. (1990). The reward-support framework and faculty commitment to their university. Research in Higher Education, 31(1), 75-97.

Schuster, J. H., & Brown, H. R. (1985). The faculty at risk. Change, 17(4), 13-21.

Slocum Jr., J. W., & Cron, W. L. (1985). Job attitudes and performance during three career stages. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 26, 126-45.

Tien, F. F., & Blackburn, R. T. (1996). Faculty rank system, research motivation, and faculty research productivity. Journal of Higher Education, 67(1), 1-22.